

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler  
Serial No. : 09/467,310  
Filed : December 17, 1999  
Page : 11 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11-29, 31-33, and 35-38 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 are independent claims. Claims 36-38 are newly submitted. Each of claims 2-3, 11, 22-23, 31, 32, and 33 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,275,225 to Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method that includes executing logic included in a function description to select an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by a user interface. Claim 1 also recites associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form.

Claim 21 recites a computer-readable medium that includes instructions to execute logic included in a function description to select an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by a user interface. Claim 21 also recites instruction to associate the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time.

With Rangarajan, after a user is authenticated during an initialization process, it is determined whether a default graphical user interface (GUI) configuration exists for the user (see, Rangarajan col. 5, lines 4-17). If a default GUI configuration does not exist, the user is presented with a series of interrogatories (in the form of a wizard) (see, Rangarajan col. 5, line 54 to col. 6, line 60). The resulting user interface is dependent on selections of the user during the wizard process in response to the interrogatories. The user may be presented with a display configuration control that provides varying displays to specify the format and information that the user desires to form part of the default configuration (see, Rangarajan col. 7, lines 45-61).

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler  
Serial No. : 09/467,310  
Filed : December 17, 1999  
Page : 12 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 ' P254

After the user traverses the presented interrogatories, a default configuration associated with the user is saved (see, Rangarajan col. 5, lines 32-35).

After it is established that a default configuration is available for the user (whether through the wizard process or from a pre-existing saved configuration), a GUI is created according to the selected configuration procedure (see, Rangarajan, col. 5, lines 39-45). This arrangement restores the selected feature set previously saved by the user.

The passage cited in the office action on col. 7, lines 45-61 of Rangarajan describes steps in the wizard process to generate a default configuration with a fixed set of features. These steps relate to the selection of selectable control areas (SCAs) to be included within the default configuration. In order to modify the default configuration of Rangarajan after it has been generated, a modify procedure must be invoked (see, Rangarajan, col. 8, lines 57-65). This modify procedure recreates the wizard structure that resulted in the default configuration to allow the user to back track over previous interrogatories and modify them as appropriate.

Rangarajan does not disclose separate and distinct function descriptions and appearance descriptions. Rather, the GUIs presented by Rangarajan are based on the selected feature sets previously saved by the user. In order to change this feature set, the modify process and associated wizard process must be invoked and a new default configuration is generated. Therefore, the functionality and the appearance of the GUIs are both established at the same time during the wizard process depending on the manner in which a user responds to the interrogatories (see, Rangarajan, col. 2, lines 26-28).

As there are no separate function and appearance descriptions (i.e., the GUI to be presented is defined by the default configuration), it would not make sense for Rangarajan to disclose (i) a function description selecting an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by a user interface after execution of a computer program has begun; and (ii) associating the function and appearance description (and in fact, Rangarajan does not disclose either of these limitations).

Accordingly, claims 1 and 21 and their respective dependent claims are allowable.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler  
Serial No. : 09/467,310  
Filed : December 17, 1999  
Page : 13 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

Claim 11 recites a method that includes selecting at least one of a map component and a fashion component according to an environment variable on the fly at run time. Claim 11 also recites associating the map component and the fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface and combining the map component and the fashion component into an executable form.

Claim 31 recites a computer-readable medium that includes instructions to select at least one of a map component and a fashion component according to an environment variable on the fly at run time. Claim 31 also recites instructions to associate the map component and the fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface.

As stated above, Rangarajan does not disclose separate function and appearance descriptions. Therefore, Rangarajan does not disclose separate map and fashion components. As a result, Rangarajan also does not disclose associating a map component and a fashion component.

Moreover, with Rangarajan, the user selects both the functionality and appearance of the user interface when generating the default configuration in the wizard process. In order to modify this configuration, a modify process is invoked and the wizard process is restarted. Neither the appearance nor the functionality may be selected according to an environment variable on the fly during run-time. Therefore, Rangarajan does not disclose that a selection of a function description or an appearance determination is made according to an environment variable on the fly during run time.

Accordingly, claims 11 and 31 and their respective dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 32 recites a system that includes means for changing the fashion component to present logic of the user interface with a different appearance during program execution.

With Rangarajan the desired selected feature set of the GUI is fixed in the default configuration. In order to modify any aspect of the default configuration (including an appearance presented by a GUI according to the default configuration), a modify process must be invoked and a wizard process reinitiated. Therefore, Rangarajan does not disclose means for

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler  
Serial No. : 09/467,310  
Filed : December 17, 1999  
Page : 14 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

changing a fashion component to present logic of a user interface with a different appearance during program execution.

Accordingly claim 32 and its dependent claims are allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangarajan. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 35 recites that a device coupled to a processor to present a user interface is a telephone. It is respectfully submitted that it was not known to use a telephone in the manner recited in claim 35 as of the filing date of the current application. In order to properly respond to the allegations in section 6 of the office action, it is respectfully requested that evidence be provided demonstrating that it was well known that a telephone connects to a PC system and utilizes a PC monitor to present a user interface associated with the telephone prior to the filing of the current application.

New Claims

Claim 36 is dependent on claim 32 and recites means for changing the map component while providing a continuity of presentation during program execution using the fashion component. This subject matter finds support on page 3, lines 19-21 and page 8, lines 6-8.

Claim 37 is dependent on claim 1 and recites customizing a selection base of function descriptions and appearance descriptions based on a geographic location of a user. This subject matter finds support on page 12, lines 2-4.

Claim 38 is dependent on claim 1 and recites that a selection of at least one of the function description and the appearance description is made according to an environment variable. This subject matter finds support on page 12, lines 5-6, page 12, lines 14-17, and Fig. 9. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is independently allowable based on reasoning similar to that provided above in connection with claims 11 and 31.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler  
Serial No. : 09/467,310  
Filed : December 17, 1999  
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 P254

As Rangarajan does not disclose the subject matter of each of claims 36-38, these claims are independently allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply a \$120 for a one month Extension of Time and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1-24-05



\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl A. Kukkonen, III  
Reg. No. 42,773

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099  
10473842.doc